# Exhibit 1

to Declaration of Neil Anthony Golding in Support of Ex Parte Application for Discovery Order Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1782

## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS (HOUSTON)

IN RE: . Case No. 21-31861

(Jointly Administered)

KATERRA, INC., et al., . Chapter 11

515 Rusk Street

Debtors. . Houston, Texas 77002

. Monday, July 19, 2021

. . . . . . . . . . . . . 1:30 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF EMERGENCY MOTION FOR ENTRY OF AN ORDER (I) APPROVING THE AMENDMENT TO THE DIP AGREEMENT AND (II) GRANTING RELATED RELIEF FILED BY DEBTOR, KATERRA, INC. [520]

## BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID R. JONES VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

#### TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:

For the Debtors: Jackson Walker, LLP

By: JENNIFER W. WERTZ, ESQ. 100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100

Austin, Texas 78701

(512) 236-2000

Jackson Walker, LLP

By: MATTHEW D. CAVENAUGH, ESQ. 1401 McKinney Street, Suite 1900

Houston, Texas 77010

(713) 752-4200

Jackson Walker LLP

By: CHRIS R. BANKLER, ESQ. 2323 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201 (214) 953-6053

#### TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES CONTINUED.

Audio Operator: Melissa Morgan, ECR

Transcription Company: Access Transcripts, LLC

10110 Youngwood Lane Fishers, IN 46038 (855) 873-2223

www.accesstranscripts.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

#### TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (Continued):

For the Debtors:

Kirkland & Ellis LLP By: GABOR BALASSA, ESQ.

CASSANDRA E. FENTON, ESQ. RAVI S. SHANKAR, ESQ.

2

300 North LaSalle Chicago, IL 60654 (312) 862-2000

Kirkland & Ellis LLP

By: JOSHUA A. SUSSBERG, ESQ. CHRISTINE A. OKIKE, ESQ.

601 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10022 (212) 446-4800

For the Unsecured Creditors' Committee:

Fox Rothschild LLP
By: GORDON GOUVEIA, ESQ.

321 N. Clark Street, Suite 1600

Chicago , IL 60654 (312) 980-3816

Fox Rothschild LLP

By: MICHAEL A. SWEET, ESQ. JACK PRAETZELLIS, ESQ.

345 California Street, Suite 2200

San Francisco, CA 94104-2670

(415) 364-5560

Fox Rothschild LLP

By: TREY A. MONSOUR, ESQ.

2843 Rusk Street Houston, TX 77003 (713) 927-7469

Fox Rothschild LLP

By: WILLIAM STASSEN, ESQ. 2000 Market Street, 20th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19103-3222 (215) 299-2853

,

Fox Rothschild LLP

By: ELIZABETH C. VIELE, ESQ. JOSEPH A. CANECO, ESQ.

101 Park Avenue, 17th Floor

New York, NY 10178 (212) 878-7968



SMTD Law LLP

Phoenix, AZ 85016 (602) 258-6219

#### TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (Continued):

For International Fidelity Insurance Company and Harco

National Insurance Company:

o de la marco

The Sherwin-Williams Company:

For Liberty Mutual Insurance Company:

For SB Investment Weil Advisers (UK) Limited By: and SoftBank:

nms

Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease LLP By: MELISSA S. GIBERSON, ESQ.

2001 East Campbell Avenue, Suite 201

3

52 East Gay Street Columbus, OH 43215 (614) 464-6400

Manier & Herod, P.C.

By: ROBERT BERENS, ESQ.

By: MICHAEL E. COLLINS, ESQ. ROBERT W. MILLER, ESQ.

1201 Demonbreun Street, Suite 900

Nashville, TN 37203 (615) 742-9350

Weil Gotshal & Manges LLP
By: JESSICA LIOU, ESQ.
SCOTT BOWLING, ESQ.
ROBERT S. BEREZIN, ESQ.
GARY T. HOLTZER, ESQ.
KEVIN F. MEADE, ESO.

KEVIN F. MEADE, ESQ. CAMERON MAE BONK, ESQ. 767 Fifth Avenue

New York, NY 10153-0119 (212) 310-8000

Weil Gotshal & Manges LLP By: ALFREDO R. PEREZ, ESQ.

700 Louisiana Street, Suite 1700

Houston, TX 77002-2784

(713) 546-5040

For Capitol Indemnity Corporation:

Clark Hill Strasburger By: DUANE J. BRESCIA, ESQ. 720 Brazos Street, Suite 700 Austin, TX 78701 (512) 499-3647

For Wells Fargo:

McGuire Woods LLP By: CHARLES HAMPTON, ESQ. 600 Travis, Suite 4200

Houston, TX 77002 (713) 225-7104

#### TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES (Continued):

For Wolff Company:

Milbank LLP

By: EVAN FLECK, ESQ. ANDREW LEBLANC, ESQ.

55 Hudson Yards

New York, NY 10001-2163

(212) 530-5567

For Haddad Heating & Plumbing, Inc., E&N Shehadi Commercial

Flooring:

Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell &

4

Berkowitz, P.C.

Construction, Inc., and By: SUSAN CREGOR MATHEWS, ESQ. 1301 McKinney Street, Suite 3700

> Houston, TX 77010 (713) 286-7165

For BP Products North America, Inc., BP Corporation North America, Inc., and Certain Affiliates:

Arnold & Porter Kay Scholer LLP By: D. TYLER NURNBERG, ESQ.

70 West Madison Street, Suite 4200

Chicago, IL 60602-4231

(312) 583-2323

Company:

For Everest Reinsurance Chiesa, Shahinian & Giantomasic P.C.

By: THOMAS WALSH, ESQ.

One Boland Drive West Orange, NJ 07052

(973) 530-2096

Husch Blackwell LLP By: RANDALL RIOS, ESQ.

600 Travis Street, Suite 2350

Houston, TX 77002 (713) 525-6226

For Zurich American Insurance Company and Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland:

Watt Tieder Hoffar & Fitzgerald LLP

By: MARGUERITE LEE DEVOLL, ESQ. 1765 Greensboro Station Place, S-1000

McLean, VA 22102 (703) 749-1046

Inc. d/b/a GameTime and By: MEGAN ADEYEMO, ESQ. GT Grandstands, Inc.:

For PlayCore Wisconsin, Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP

2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 3700

Dallas, TX 75201 (214) 231-4726

For Danisney Mejia:

Wingate Russotti Shapiro & Halperin

LLP

By: NOAH KATZ, ESQ.

420 Lexington Avenue, Suite 2750

New York, NY 10170

(347) 767-4470



WITNESSES	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
FOR THE DEBTORS:				
Marc Liebman	63	82		
Matthew Niemann	98	113	123	
Pamela Corrie	126	143		

<u>EXHIBITS</u>	ID	<u>ADMITTED</u>
Debtors' Exhibits 578-4		60
Debtors' Exhibits 578-6		60
Debtors' Exhibits 578-7		60
Committee's Exhibit 21		63
Committee's Exhibit 22		63
Committee's Exhibit 23		63
Committee's Exhibit 24		63

#### Corrie - Direct/Bankler 126 MR. MONSOUR: My partner, Mr. Stassen. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. So I just 3 continue to get this wrong. I'm always one behind. All right. 4 Thank you. All right. 5 Mr. Bankler, whenever you're ready. MR. BANKLER: Thank you, Your Honor. 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7 8 BY MR. BANKLER: 9 Ms. Corrie, will you please introduce yourself to the 10 Court. Hi. My name is Pamela Corrie, and I'm one of the two 11 12 independent directors for Katerra. 13 When did you become an independent director of Katerra? On September 23rd of 2020. 14 A 15 Q When you say that you're an independent director, what 16 does "independent" mean to you in that context? 17 It means at a time when Katerra was struggling and facing 18 significant challenges, I was contacted by the attorneys for 19 Katerra and -- as were a number of other people, I assume. And 20 there were interviews conducted by the then-current board of 21 Katerra, of the potential candidates to become independent 22∥ directors -- which means I had no prior connections whatsoever 23 with Katerra. Did you have any prior connections with SoftBank? 24 I did not. 25 A

127

- In the meantime, have you had -- aside from your role as  $2 \parallel$  an independent director of Katerra, any connections with 3 SoftBank?
- 4 I have not.

- 5 I assume you heard Mr. Monsour's opening argument here,  $6\parallel$  where he talked about the releases for the directors of Katerra. Did you hear him make that argument?
- 8 Yes, I did. Α
- 9 Ms. Corrie, is it your understanding that you would be 10 | released in connection with this DIP financing here today?
- It is my understanding that I most certainly would not be 11 12 released, nor would the other independent director; and in fact 13 $\parallel$  this is a clarification that we made on the record for
- Mr. Stassen when I was deposed by him over the weekend.
- 15 In connection with Katerra's filing, did you become aware that SoftBank was requesting a release?
- 17 Α I did.
- 18 What was your first step after you heard that request from 19 SoftBank?
- 20 A Well, I immediately met with Harvey Tepner, who's the 21 $\parallel$  other independent director, and we determined that it would be 22 important to immediately begin an investigation of any actions by SoftBank that could potentially be a release, to make sure 24 $\parallel$  that there was not a significant asset of the estate that was 25 inadvertently being released.

1

13

14

16

#### Corrie - Direct/Bankler

128

And once Harvey and I met and we determined to proceed  $2 \parallel$  with an independent investigation, we really immediately 3 reached out to Jackson Walker, who had just been contacted to 4 serve as local counsel for Katerra. And we spoke with you and 5 certain of your partners to ensure -- and to convince ourselves 6 that you, in fact, were -- had no conflicts of interest and could perform an investigation of SoftBank, both as far as your 8 independence, your lack of conflicts, and also that you had the capacity to do so quickly, because we knew we were going to be 10 very pressed in time to conduct this investigation; and that 11 $\parallel$  you were able to do it in a reasonable manner, both time-wise and economically. Because we knew that the debtor had significant liquidity constraints.

- After your selection of the independent investigators, what was the first step in the investigations?
- We instructed the attorneys at Jackson Walker to send document requests to SoftBank, and we really spent a 18 substantial amount of time doing a full data dump of our 19 experience with Katerra, since we were involved in the previous September, and also what we had learned during that period of time, to give you all the information we could to jumpstart your putting together a request -- document request for SoftBank. And we also instructed you to begin your review of 24 $\parallel$  the documents that could be produced -- that could be found from Katerra itself, and its officers and directors.

### Corrie - Direct/Bankler 129 What was your understanding of the -- where documents for 1 2 the investigation should come from? Well, the biggest black box for us was SoftBank itself. 3 A 4 And so that was why our initial focus was to work on the 5 document requests -- have you guys work on the document 6 requests from SoftBank. 7 But we also wanted to review -- wanted you to review the 8 emails and communications from Katerra -- between Katerra and SoftBank, to see if there was anything further to be found 10 there. UNIDENTIFIED: (Audio interference) --11 THE COURT: I did not hear that statement. 12 13 All right. We'll just assume that someone forgot to 14 mute their phone. 15 All right. Mr. Bankler, go ahead, please. 16 MR. BANKLER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MR. BANKLER: Do you have an understanding, Ms. Corrie, of how many 18 Q 19 documents, approximately, SoftBank produced in connection with 20 the investigation? Yes, I do. I believe they produced over 2,000 documents. 21 Did you personally review any of those documents? 22 I did review some of them, yes. I worked with our 23

24 counsel, you and your partners, to have you identify the

25 documents you thought that were important for the Committee,

130

1 the independent -- you know, investigation committee, to 2 review. And I did identify -- I did review certain of those 3 documents myself. In addition, of course, I looked through 4 some of my own emails, and also personally read some of the 5 Katerra documents that had been produced.

- Did you direct the investigators to review and search 6 Q through the emails produced by SoftBank?
- 8 Α I did.

9

17

- We heard about witness examinations earlier. What was 10 | your direction to the investigators with regard to interviewing 11 witnesses in connection with this investigation?
- Well, we directed Jackson Walker to investigate, through 12 A 13 interviews, the current and former officers and directors of 14 Katerra, as well as certain people from SoftBank, the former officer -- I'm sorry, the former director and the then-current 16 director.

And also, as we continued to meet on a regular basis with 18 the attorneys from Jackson Walker, to discuss the documents 19 that were being produced, we worked with the attorneys to identify additional people at SoftBank that would be -- it would be important to interview, based on their role with Greensill or their role with Katerra.

- Which witnesses from the Katerra management team were 23 interviewed in connection with the investigation?
- 25 The CEO, Paal Kibsgaard, was -- had a witness interview;

131

1 as well as Krishna Shivram, who is the former CFO; Brendan  $2 \parallel Franich$ , who is the former general counsel; and Mollie Fadule, 3 who was the operational person with the company, and that 4 remains with the company today.

- Who were the witnesses from SoftBank who were interviewed 6 in connection with the investigation?
- Jeff Housenbold, who is the former director, who no longer 8 is with SoftBank. Mahd Abdar (phonetic), who is the current director, who represents SoftBank on the board. And then two  $10\,\parallel$  additional individuals, Tom Cheung and Saleh Romeih, who both -11 - both of whose names became apparent as having a substantial 12 nexus to Katerra and the decisions made with respect to 13 Greensill as a result of the document production that was done 14 by SoftBank.
- 15 Did independent directors, including yourself, receive detailed reports of these witness interviews?
- We did, yes. We met with our counsel at Jackson Walker, 18 on a weekly or more than a weekly basis, and we discussed the 19 specifics and the relevant information that came out of the 20 witness interviews that would be most probative with respect to the investigation.
- 22 Did you personally speak with any of the witnesses in connection with the (audio interference) --
- 24 A I did. Of course the dogs haven't barked all day, so I'm 25 so sorry.

5

7

Corrie - Direct/Bankler 132 THE COURT: That's quite all right. 1 2 THE WITNESS: (Audio interference) 3 Yes, I did. I spoke both to follow up, after the 4 witness interviews of both Paal Kibsqaard and Mollie Fadule, to 5 clarify some information that had come out, not only in their 6 interviews, but in the interviews of the SoftBank employees. BY MR. BANKLER: 7 8 So, from a documents and witness interview perspective, were you and the other independent directors closely involved 10 in monitoring and directing this investigation? Yes, we were closely involved. We pushed very hard. We 11 12 were definitely slave drivers for the attorneys at Jackson 13 Walker and we demanded regular updates, which, once the 14 documents started coming in -- they came in a rolling basis 15 from Weil Gotshal and SoftBank. And once they started coming 16 in, we met at least on a weekly basis and more often --17 typically, more often than that. Moving away from the process of the investigation, let's 18 Q 19∥ talk a little bit about some of the claims and issues that have 20 come up, principally raised by the objection of the UCC here. 21 First I'll just ask you, generally, what was the process in 22∥ terms of the investigation for identifying and evaluating 23 potential claims against SoftBank?

So, as the facts began to come in, and we built our

25∥ understanding of what had happened with SoftBank -- and

133

1 specifically, in the area of the Greensill transaction, we then 2 focused -- Jackson Walker directed that the existence of 3 claims, the type of -- certain legal actions to develop what 4 claims were out there, and how did the facts tie into those 5 claims, so that we could evaluate potential causes of action 6 and the strength of the facts in supporting any cause of action. And we worked closely with Jackson Walker through that time, discussing the application of the facts to the law.

You saw in the objection submitted by the UCC that they 10 | believe that there are potential breach of contract and implied 11 covenant of good faith claims against SoftBank. As part of 12 your investigation, did you consider those types of claims?

13 A Yes, we certainly did. And specifically, the claims 14 that arose out of the preferred share purchase agreement, 15 which contained a further assurances clause. We were --16 Jackson Walker identified that clause, and we talked about it 17∥ extensively, because we felt that it did create a requirement 18 that SoftBank produce additional documents as requested by 19 Katerra.

And since we had -- a significant black box existed as to what happened with Greensill, and how had SoftBank paid off 22 $\parallel$  Greensill or what deal had they made. And that black box, of course, raised our concerns that something had happened that 24∥ were weren't aware of, and that perhaps wasn't what we had been 25 told by SoftBank.

8

9

1

8

9

11

19

#### Corrie - Direct/Bankler

134

And so we did demand -- repeatedly requested from SoftBank 2 management, and Katerra repeatedly requested of SoftBank, the 3 underlying documentation that existed between SoftBank and 4 Greensill to support the fact that the Greensill facility had 5 been paid off. And so we were actually very concerned that 6∥there was -- and I don't know if concerned is -- but we were very focused on the potential cause of action, given the facts in the case.

assessment of the viability of a breach of contract type claim? Well, unfortunately, what we found is that there were a 12 lot of weaknesses with such a claim. And I think the 13 weaknesses started off with the fact that -- in the context of 14 $\parallel$  the recapitalization at the end of December in 2020, Katerra entered into a contribution and exchange agreement, which clearly set out the cancellation of the Greensill debt. That

it had been terminated, cancelled, and all obligations of

18 Katerra under that facility were discharged.

After completing your investigation, what is your

So when Katerra went back to SoftBank and said, well, show us that we were discharged, they said you've got a document that shows you were discharged. And the fact that we wanted to understand what had happened between Greensill and SoftBank, arguably, might not have -- arguably, we might not have been 24  $\parallel$  entitled to that, under the further assurance clause. 25 were concerned about that.

1

8

9

10

18

19

#### Corrie - Direct/Bankler

135

But I think of equal importance, if not more so, is when 2 we pressed Jackson Walker to complete a legal review of that  $3 \parallel \text{type}$  of cause of action -- a cause of action under a further 4 assurances clause, what we found is there really wasn't much  $5\parallel$  case law out there to support bringing this type of claim 6 against SoftBank based on these facts. And in fact, the only case that we found there that really supported the cause of action under a further assurances clause was on wildly different facts and circumstances than existed here.

And our sense was that a further assurances clause is really an administrative provision, where if you need something to allow you to file your UCC statements or whatever, you exercise your rights under the further assurances clause. But to apply our request for -- to see what had happened between Greensill and SoftBank, they -- you know, provide us with all those underlying documents, because we think we might have been damaged by your failure to do so, really got us into the realm of something that was highly speculative.

So what type of damages could we prove from the fact that we didn't get the underlying documents? And as we spoke, extensively, about the potential cause of action, I think we all came to a similar conclusion, which is that damages -first of all, (audio interference) this type of damages were not considered in any of the case law. And of equal importance, that -- showing, proving damages to Katerra, that

136

1 Katerra was destroyed by the fact that it didn't receive these  $2 \parallel$  documents, and couldn't go to the press, couldn't defend 3 itself, was so speculative, was so attenuated, that we felt 4 that it would be extremely difficult to maintain a cause of 5 action under those legal theories.

- Ms. Corrie, the UCC also identified potential breach of fiduciary duty claims against SoftBank's representatives on 8 Katerra's board of directors. As part of your investigation, did you evaluate potential breach of fiduciary duty claims?
- We did, yes. 10

- What was your assessment on the viability of those types 11 12 of claims?
- 13 A Again, we found many facts that showed that SoftBank had 14 not been forthcoming with Katerra about its underlying -- about 15∥ the details of its underlying obligation with Greensill. And 16 while we might have wished that it had been more transparent, 17 we did not find that any of the facts that we discovered rose  $18 \parallel$  to the level of breach of fiduciary duty. And so we just 19 thought that there were some very serious issues with pursuing a fiduciary duty claim against the directors.
- 21 Did you evaluate any -- you are a lawyer by training, 22∥Ms. Corrie, but I'm not asking you to give your legal opinion 23 here. But did you --
- Oh, thank goodness for that. I'm a recovering lawyer. 24 Α
- 25 As part of your investigation, did you evaluate any

3

8

9

17

21

24

25

#### Corrie - Direct/Bankler

137

1 potential roadblocks for a breach of fiduciary duty claim in 2 this context?

We did. And it's going to be a run-on answer, so stop me  $4 \parallel$  at any point. But I think the first thing we made ourselves 5 comfortable about was that SoftBank had not gone rogue and done 6 anything on the board that was not reviewed fully by the independent legal and financial advisors that the board had retained.

So, as a threshold matter, independent legal and financial  $10\parallel$  advisors advising the full board, and often excluding SoftBank 11 from decisions of the board if there was a perceived conflict. 12 And then, based on what appeared in our view to be the exercise 13 of its business judgment relying on the advice of those financial experts and legal advisors, the board voted on the transactions that were put in front of it, and approved those 16 actions.

And not only did the board approve the recapitalization, 18 but -- in 2020, but, in fact, the board and the company took 19 $\parallel$  the recapitalization to the shareholders, and the shareholders 20 approved those actions.

And so what you have is something that's set up from a perspective of corporate governance of everybody exercising their obligations, we found, in a way that was consistent with their fiduciary duties.

And then, on top of that, we had the reality that SoftBank

138

1 was released in December of 2020 from all actions leading up to 2 the recapitalization. And all we were left with was, you know, 3 what came in the first few months of 2021. And that those 4 releases, you know -- and not only releases, but the  $5\parallel$  exoneration that was -- I'm sorry, the exculpation that was 6 provided in the articles of the association of Katerra, basically made SoftBank -- you know, took them out of the realm of being vulnerable or liable to any claims that could be brought under a fiduciary duty cause of action.

And then, finally, the facts didn't support a material impact of SoftBank's actions as a board -- as board members, didn't support any kind of material damage that had occurred to Katerra. So, putting all of that -- and I warned you it would be a long answer, but putting all of that into perspective, we  $15\parallel--$  in the exercise of our business judgment, we did not feel 16 that there was a good cause of action to pursue, especially weighing that against not having a DIP.

- Hopefully this one shouldn't require as long of an answer, 19 Ms. Corrie. If --
- 20 Α Okay.

8

9

10

13

18

21

- Putting aside the potential claims against SoftBank's 22 $\parallel$  representatives on Katerra's board, did you evaluate other 23 potential claims directly against SoftBank?
- The last set of claims we evaluated was under our 25 $\parallel$  controlling shareholder theory, of whether there was some

139

1 potential liability there. And we found that probably to be  $2 \parallel$  the very weakest of all of the areas that we looked into. 3 know, it's hard to prove that the stockholders, you know, have 4 these obligations -- or controlling shareholders -- and that 5 their behavior resulted in -- we really didn't see anything  $6\parallel$  that SoftBank did as a controlling shareholder, even if it were deemed to be one post recapitalization -- that resulted in damage to Katerra.

And specifically what we saw was a situation where SoftBank had put in excess of \$2 billion -- in fact, it started 11 $\parallel$  to approach \$3 billion, and received no return at any point 12 along the way. And then, on top of everything else, they got the releases through the recapitalization. So, you know, we didn't see any set of facts that had -- that related to the SoftBank's behavior post-recap -- nor pre-recap, but not 16 post-recap when there were no release in place, that would support a cause of action for a controlling shareholder.

In fact, you know, all SoftBank did was they said we've 19 given and we've given and we've contributed and we've supported this company, and we can no longer do so. And while that was highly regrettable to the independent members of the board, and certainly highly regrettable for management, it just seemed like that that was within their rights as an investor to do so.

You may have heard His Honor's question early in the day, but I think you might have just touched on an answer that I

8

9

18

140

1 think would get close to answering His Honor's question, which  $2 \parallel$  was along the lines of SoftBank's liability related to whether 3 its officers or itself -- what us lawyers would call an 4 interested transaction or something that it received benefits  $5 \parallel$  from. I'm not going to ask you to opine on that, Ms. Corrie, 6 but I think I did hear you say that, as part of your investigation, you looked at benefits that SoftBank received over the course of its investment in Katerra, right?

9 Α Yes.

8

- 10 From the course of your investigation, did you see that 11 SoftBank had ever received any distributions, dividends, 12 payments of any kind?
- 13 A To the contrary. We were certain that SoftBank had not 14 received any dividends or distributions throughout the period 15∥ of time that it was an investor in SoftBank [sic].
- 16 Based on your investigation, is it accurate to say that 17∥the only interest or payment of any kind that SoftBank got over 18  $\parallel$  the course of its investments was equity ownership?
- 19 A Absolutely. And most recently, through the 20 recapitalization, SoftBank put in \$200 million, and received 21 about 75 percent of the equity of Katerra, which, based on the 22 $\parallel$  balance sheet at that time, was probably -- probably what they 23 had contributed. The \$200 million was in excess of what the 24 equity was worth.
  - I'm going to move on to two quick, final points,

141

1 Ms. Corrie. The first is, putting aside the substance of the  $2 \parallel$  claims, did you examine the relative costs and benefits of 3 pursuing litigation against SoftBank?

We certainly did, and we directed Jackson Walker to fully 5 brief us as to their thoughts about what a litigation would  $6\parallel$  cost, how long it would take. And so we looked at the cost and benefits, and the likelihood of success, discounting any 8 probable or possible recovery by the likelihood of success on the merits, and we concluded that the litigation would likely be expensive, quite expensive, and last a long time.

SoftBank is a huge corporation, and it's multinational. 12 | The witnesses that we would need are literally scattered around the globe. And at the end of the day, embarking on such a litigation, where we thought that there was no valuable claim to pursue, seemed like folly, under any circumstances, and certainly when you weighed the likelihood of what would happen with respect to the DIP dissolving, disappearing, and you know, 18 the liquidity no longer being there for the company to pursue.

- Ms. Corrie, as a director of Katerra, have you considered some of the DIP financing options that we heard about from Mr. Niemann and Mr. Liebman earlier?
- 22 Yes. Those came in last night and this morning, and we certainly have reviewed them, fairly -- in a fairly full way --24 you know, robust way, between last night and this morning.

And really, with the same conclusions that were offered by

4

11

13

19

142

1 Mr. Niemann in his testimony, that it would be great if we 2 could close on one of those and take out SoftBank, because 3 they're difficult to deal with. But -- nothing personal (indiscernible) -- but that, in the meantime, there are 5 contingencies and we have to complete those contingencies. 6 have to -- a number of things have to be done before the money is going to be funded from an alternative DIP.

And here's the deal. I'm a member of the board of directors. I'm not a gambler, and I don't think it would be 10 $\parallel$  prudent of me to gamble with the estate's money, and I don't think it's -- I don't think -- I would never want to make a Hail Mary pass. And either putting all of our eggs in the 13 basket, litigating against SoftBank, or saying let's just go bare and have no DIP here and have no liquidity and have the 15∥ company, which is barely being held together by A&M, as far as keeping the contractors and subcontractors in place, and working on the projects, and having them all find out that 18 we're going bare, here, that is really gambling everything on these releases. And that would not be something that I, in the exercise of my judgment, as a fiduciary of the company (audio interference) --

MR. BANKLER: Thank you. I'll pass the witness.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Anyone else who supports the DIP have any questions 25 for Ms. Corrie?

7

8

9

19

20

21

22

23

```
Corrie - Cross/Stassen
                                                                 143
 1
        (No audible response)
 2
             THE COURT: All right. Mr. Stassen.
 3
             MR. STASSEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
 4
                           CROSS-EXAMINATION
 5 BY MS. STASSEN:
 6
        Good evening, Ms. Corrie.
   Q
 7
   Α
       Good evening, Will.
 8
   Q Good to see you again on such a short turnaround.
 9
   Α
       Yes.
10 0
        So a couple questions related to what you've testified
11\parallel about on direct. A number of questions referred to -- and I
12\parallel want to make clear, your investigation was not as a result of
13 the objection filed by the Creditors' Committee, correct?
14
        No, it was not.
  Α
15 II
        It started before the objection was filed by the
16 Creditors' Committee, correct?
17
       (No audible response)
18
             THE COURT: Ms. Corrie, we seem to have lost you.
19 Perhaps did earphones die, maybe?
             THE WITNESS: (Audio interference)
20
             THE COURT: Oh, there -- you're back. You're back.
21
22
             THE WITNESS: Well, I'm glad you can hear me. I'm
23 frozen on my own (audio interference) --
24
             THE COURT: So you're also cutting out. Why don't
25\parallel you do this. We're not going to go anywhere.
```

```
Corrie - Cross/Stassen
                                                                144
             THE WITNESS: Yes.
 1
             THE COURT: Why don't you disconnect and come back
 2
 3
   in.
 4
             THE WITNESS: Okay. Will do. Do it right away.
 5
  Thank you.
             THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
 6
 7
             Mr. Stassen, sorry for the interruption, but I'm
 8
   assuming you would rather have it a planned interruption than
 9
   right in the middle of your Perry Mason moment.
10
             MR. STASSEN: It's amazing, Your Honor, that these
11 don't happen more often, so --
             THE COURT: Do you know it's - really haven't, for 16
12
13 or 17 months, however long it's been, haven't had half a dozen.
   So I'm going to kick -- oh, she came in through the web, as
15\parallel opposed to the app. She timed out, my guess.
             MR. STASSEN: I don't know if this is a time to take
16
  a short break for people -- well, maybe she can come back in
18 right away.
19
             THE COURT: No, fair enough. Let me ask -- and I
   will stay right here. Does anyone need -- oh, well, there she
   is already. All right. You're in --
22
             THE WITNESS: Can you hear me?
             THE COURT: Yes.
23
24
             THE WITNESS: Okay.
25
             THE COURT: Perfect.
```

#### Corrie - Cross/Stassen 145 THE WITNESS: Well, I just accomplished the one thing 1 $2 \parallel I$ know I how to do, which is reboot. So thank you, Your Honor, for the recommendation. 3 4 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Stassen. 5 Let me ask -- Mr. Stassen had posed the question as to whether or not a short break would be appropriate. 6 7 Ms. Corrie, you have been listening all afternoon, and I'm going to totally defer to you. Do you need a short 8 9 break or are you okay? 10 THE WITNESS: I don't, but you've been sitting without any break, so -- I'm happy to take a break, but I don't 11 12 need one. 13 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Stassen, are you okay? MR. STASSEN: I will make it through, Your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: No. If you need a break, I'm happy to take five minutes. As everyone knows, I will sit here all day long and never move. And so I get insensitive to those issues. So -- but if you need a break, let's take a break. 18 19 MR. STASSEN: (Audio interference) --20 MR. SUSSBERG: (Audio interference) Your Honor, once we complete Ms. Corrie, that's going to be the end of the case

for the company. So it might be a good point, at that moment in time, to take a break before the UCC puts its case on.

THE COURT: Fair enough. Mr. Sussberg, I'm reading 25∥ between the lines, and Ms. Stassen needs a five-minute break.

23

```
Corrie - Cross/Stassen
                                                                 146
             So it's 6:34. We're going to break for five minutes.
 1
 2
   We'll get started at 6:40 Central Time. All right?
 3
             MR. STASSEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
 4
             THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 5
             THE COURT: Thank you.
         (Recess taken at 6:34 p.m.)
 6
 7
         (Proceedings resumed at 6:41 p.m.)
 8
             THE COURT: All right. The time is 6:41 Central.
 9
   are back on the record.
             Mr. Stassen, whenever you're ready.
10
             MR. STASSEN: Yes. First of all, thank you, Your
11
12 Honor, for the courtesy break.
13 BY MR. STASSEN:
        Ms. Corrie, there are several questions asked during your
14
15∥ direct regarding potential claims identified by the Committee
16 and its objections -- or its objection and whether or not you'd
  done an assessment of those claims. Do you remember that?
18
        Yes.
   Α
        But if I understand your testimony correctly, you started
19
20\parallel the investigation not as a result of the objection but as a
21 result of your own independent determination that you should
22\parallel look into whether there is valuable claims being released as a
23 result of this DIP funding. Is that correct?
24
        That's correct.
   Α
25
   Q
        And I think you'd probably agree with me that during the
```

147

1 course of your investigation, you probably have access to more 2 documents and more witness, perhaps, than the Committee did

3 before it prepared its objections. Is that correct?

- I don't -- I don't know the answer to that. It's 5 | something I -- I know that we directed Jackson Walker to 6 collaborate very closely with the Committee, and my 7 understanding is that that had happened, but I don't know 8 whether you saw all the documents that Jackson Walker saw or not.
- 10 Okay. And the total timeframe for you to conduct the investigation that you testified about on direct was 12 approximately how long?
- 13 A Well, I think we started probably the day before the 14∥ bankruptcy filing, so that was June 9th, I believe, June 8th.
- 15 Q So --

4

- 16 A No, I'm sorry --
- 17 -- so that --
- 18 A -- we filed on the 6th, I think, so maybe 5th, so five 19 weeks.
- 20 Q Five weeks. Okay. Thank you.
- And as a result of the investigation that you conducted, 21 22 $\parallel$  obviously with the assistance of professionals, you identified several potential claim areas. Is that correct? 23
- 24 That is correct. Α
- 25 Q And one of those claims related to a claim against

- 1 SoftBank, correct?
- $2 \parallel A$  So the -- maybe I didn't understand. I mean, I discussed
- 3 in my direct that there were different claims based on
- 4 different legal theories and -- and specifically, we had looked
- 5 at three. One was the contract breach, one was fiduciary duty,
- 6 another was controlling shareholder, and those were all against
- 7 SoftBank.
- 8 Q Okay. Let's deal with the SoftBank piece first, and we'll
- 9 come back to the fiduciary duty analysis and investigation that
- 10 you conducted.
- 11 With regard to SoftBank, there was some -- you've been
- 12 present for the testimony of the prior witnesses, correct?
- 13 A Correct.
- 14 Q And you heard one of the witnesses testify about the
- 15 Greensill failure. Do you remember that?
- 16 A You mean the --
- 17 Q Do you remember that?
- 18 A -- financial failure of Greensill?
- 19 0 Correct.
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q Okay. And prior to the Greensill failure, what was your
- 22 view of the -- were you optimistic with regard to Katerra's
- 23 future?
- 24 A Yes, I was.
- 25 Q And was that optimism shared by your fellow board members

1 and management?

2

- A Yes, it was, as far as I know.
- $3 \mid Q$  And that optimism was based on facts, wasn't it?
- $4 \mid A$  Well, what it was based on was basically two months,
- 5 two-and-a-half months of performance post-recapitalization,
- 6 that for the first time in its several-year history since
- 7 Katerra was formed, Katerra performed -- the company performed
- 8 and met its projection for several months, and so it was the
- 9 tiny little green shoot and -- but it was the first time that
- 10 Katerra had met its projections, so yes, we were optimistic
- 11 that with a new management team and the new capital structure,
- 12 that it could continue to perform in months three, four, and so
- on and meet its projection. And those projections were that
- 14 Katerra would continue to lose money in 2021 but hopefully
- 15 become profitable at some point in 2022.
- Q And that all changed with the Greensill Financial failure,
- 17 didn't it?
- 18 A Certainly, things, yes, became much more complicated once
- 19 the negative press arose after the Greensill failure.
- 20 Q Okay. And do you understand that SoftBank has significant
- 21 investment or had significant investments in Greensill?
- $22 \parallel A$  I do understand that now, and I think we always understood
- 23 that there was a relationship between Greensill and SoftBank,
- 24 but I don't think -- I personally did not have any kind of
- 25 in-depth understanding as to what the details of that

150

1 relationship were.

- Q Okay. And there was some testimony earlier today with regard to news media reports. I think the Wall Street Journal was mentioned specifically by a prior witness that related to the Greensill bankruptcy. Do you recall that?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q Okay. What do you recall with regard to the *Wall Street* 8 *Journal* article relating to Greensill?
- 9 A What I recall is that it basically said, or postulated,
  10 that Katerra might be on the hook for owing Greensill
  11 \$440 million, which was the amount that we knew that SoftBank
- had paid off to -- to Greensill as part of the recapitalization. And so we were --
- 14 O So --
- 15 A -- we were dismayed to see that because we felt that that 16 would be a negative -- create a negative fall in the market.
- 17 Q Did it, in fact, create a negative fall in the market?
- 18 A It did.
- 19 Q What was the impact of that news report on Katerra?
- A Well, at the time that the news report came out, Katerra
  was working on one of the important parts, important work
  streams that would be critical to its ability to succeed, which
  was setting up a new funding line with sureties, and the staff
  at Katerra and the executives at Katerra were negotiating, were
- 25 in the process of negotiating for that new bonding line, and we

151

1 did not have a new bonding line in -- in place at that time,  $2 \parallel$  but negotiations were moving forward. And as a result of that 3 press, the sureties with whom we were speaking raised concerns 4 that, in fact, Katerra might have exposure, and that might put 5 their willingness to enter into these bonding lines with 6 Katerra in a different light. And indeed, those sureties did withdraw from negotiations with Katerra.

Mr. Bankler asked you what SoftBank employees or Softbank people you or your professionals interviewed as part of this 10 investigation. Do you recall that testimony?

AUTOMATED VOICE: Our system will end this conference 12 $\parallel$  in five minutes. To extend this call for one hour, please 13 enter the moderator PIN now.

BY MR. STASSEN: 14

8

11

15

20

23

So you said you interviewed or caused you to --

16 AUTOMATED VOICE: Your conference has been extended for 60 minutes.

18 BY MR. STASSEN:

19 Is that correct?

Mahd Abdar -- Jeff Housenbold was the former SoftBank 21 $\parallel$  appointee to the board, longstanding, who then left SoftBank, 22 $\parallel$  and Mahd Abdar is a very new appointee by SoftBank.

In addition, Tom Cheung and Saleh Romeih were all -- and I don't -- and I'm sorry, but I'm not sure how to say his last 25 $\parallel$  name, but they also were -- interviewed by --

And did --0

1

2

7

8

18

20

24

Α -- Jackson Walker.

3 To your knowledge, did Katerra reach out to SoftBank and  $4 \parallel$  say something to the effect of, can you please confirm  $5\parallel$  publically that the \$440 million is no longer owed by Katerra 6 to Greensill?

- Yes. The executives at Katerra did reach out to SoftBank and make that request.
- 9 Did the two SoftBank board members, appointed board  $10 \parallel$  members, to your knowledge, do anything to attempt to confirm 11 that that \$440 million had been paid off?
- Well, again, Jeff Housenbold was no longer with SoftBank, 12 A 13 but I do know that the executives -- I think Paal or perhaps 14 $\parallel$  Krishna, the CEO or the CFO at that time, did reach out with --15 did reach out to SoftBank and ask for help, and then when they 16 didn't hear anything back right away, they reached out to Jeff and said, can you help us. And whether or not he did anything, I -- I can't say. I don't think I know that and if I do, I 19 don't remember.

And then Mahd, who was not -- who was appointed to the board, I want to say in March of 2021, did repeatedly go to Softbank and -- and press them to be in contact with Katerra and to talk to us about these requests.

And did SoftBank respond with assurances that the Katerra debt to Greensill had been paid?

153

They did not. They were not particularly responsive to 2 the requests of -- of Katerra for clarification.

- And I think one of the things you mentioned on your direct 4 was you analyzed that there was a contract between Katerra and 5 SoftBank that required it to give assurances in relation to the 6 connection between the two companies and their agreements. that correct?
- 8 Α Correct.

1

3

7

- 9 And did SoftBank give those assurances?
- 10 They did not.
- 11 What resulted to Katerra as a result of the failure to 12 give assurances to the marketplace that the \$440 million was no 13 longer owed to Greensill?
- Well, Katerra did respond to the marketplace, to its -- as I understand it, the executives at the time let us know that 16 they were speaking to the sureties and they were speaking to 17 $\parallel$  the contractors, subcontractors, owners who were asking them, 18 and they were letting them know that, in fact, as part of the 19 recapitalization, the Greensill obligations were repaid in full and, you know, we have the documents to prove that. I -- I can't say -- I don't know whether that document was shown to anyone in particular or to everyone. I just don't know that information, but I do know that the management of Katerra were 24  $\parallel$  trying to actively manage the anxiety -- the anxiety in the 25∥ marketplace and the uncertainty by assuring them that here's

154

1 the -- the document to show that the -- or we have a document 2 that shows, that proves that, in fact, the Greensill 3 obligations were repaid in full and canceled and discharged and 4 that Katerra no longer had any obligations there.

So those communications were ongoing, but they didn't --6 they didn't succeed in -- in quelling the anxiety of the marketplace in full, and we did have agreements in the pipeline 8 that went away. Can I say that it was only for that reason? can't. But it -- it did happen during that period of time, and 10 we did have our discussions with sureties basically come to an abrupt ending, as -- as I've mentioned previously.

You mentioned on your direct that at some point in time, SoftBank told you, you already have an agreement, why don't you just show that agreement to whoever's asking, or something to that effect. I'm paraphrasing. Do you recall that testimony or something to that effect?

Well, I think -- I think what I meant to say, and I don't 18 recall exactly what I said, so I -- I apologize, but what I --19 what the facts was that we had an agreement, we've asked for SoftBank for more information, they did not provide it, so we tried to do the best we could. And when I say "we," it's really management that is talking directly with vendors and owners and -- and what have you. Management did their very  $24\parallel$  best to -- to settle the anxiety in the marketplace, given the 25 facts that we had at hand.

5

12

155

In the meantime, management continued to ask SoftBank for  $2 \parallel$  a number of things, not just for their assurances, not just the 3 information underlying the Greensill-SoftBank transaction, but 4 also for a bonding line or for cash to put in accounts so that  $5\parallel$  we could provide cash collateral to the -- to the sureties, and  $6\parallel$  also for additional funding to help what was becoming a very bad liquidity situation again at Katerra. So there were many asks that were made over a month or two period of time.

- And was SoftBank responsive to those asks?
- They did not respond specifically to the asks. They spoke 11 with management and they said that this would have to go to the 12 | highest levels at SoftBank, up to Masa Son who makes the final decisions at SoftBank, and there was a -- a time set for the (indiscernible) at Katerra to speak to Masa Son that was ultimately postponed and rescheduled for perhaps a week later and ultimately took place -- I believe it was in early June.
  - There was testimony from a prior witness that the Greensill financial failure is what caused the failure of -financial failure of Katerra. Do you agree with that statement?
  - MR. SUSSBERG: I'm going to object --

No, I'm sorry. Late -- late May of 2020.

THE WITNESS: Well --23

1

8

9

10

13

18

19

20

21

22

24 MR. SUSSBERG: -- to that as misstating the evidence 25 $\parallel$  but go ahead, Ms. Corrie. If you can answer the question,

```
Corrie - Cross/Stassen
                                                               156
 1 please do.
             THE WITNESS: I think we all --
 2
 3
             MR. SUSSBERG: (Indiscernible) objection, Your Honor.
 4
             THE COURT: All right.
 5
             THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
 6
             THE COURT: Mr. Stassen.
 7
             MR. STASSEN: Yeah, I -- I'll rephrase the question.
 8 That's probably the easiest thing to do.
 9
             THE COURT: All right.
10 BY MR. STASSEN:
        Do you recall testimony from an earlier witness, she was
12 talking about the various DIP financing options that related
13 the Greensill financial failure to the Katerra financial
14 failure. Do you recall that?
15 A
        I do recall the testimony.
        Okay. Do you agree with that testimony?
16 Q
17
             MR. SUSSBERG: Mr. Stassen, I'm going to object to
18 that question. It's confusing and vague. Can you please ask
19 specifically -- I'm sorry. I'll just state my objection, Your
20 Honor. I --
21
             THE COURT: So --
22
             MR. STASSEN: That's fine. I think -- sorry, Your
23 Honor. I don't --
24
             THE COURT: No --
25
             MR. STASSEN: -- you started talking.
```

157

THE COURT: Ms. Corrie, did you -- you are a uniquely  $2 \parallel$  qualified witness. Did you understand the question?

THE WITNESS: I do understand the question.

THE COURT: Then go ahead and --

1

3

4

5

8

13

14

15

THE WITNESS: I guess how I'd like to answer it is 6 from my own point of view, do I believe that the Greensill debacle negatively impacted Katerra in its -- in it significant way? I did feel that way at the time. Absolutely. We felt that we were barely coming out of the 2020 recapitalization. 10 $\parallel$  We were barely getting on our feet, and we were trying to accomplish this major hurdle, which was putting surety lines in 12 place, and the bad press started coming out, and we couldn't get ahead of it and ultimately, you know, we couldn't recover from that.

So I do -- I do agree with that to a large extent, which 16 is why we were very interested in the further assurances cause of action. We -- we felt that -- that Katerra suffered because 18 $\parallel$  of the Greensill debacle. And we hoped that we would have a 19 significant cause of action as a result but as I testified to in my direct, when we really broke it down and we looked at the 21 -- the legal elements of a cause of action, and we looked at 22 $\parallel$  the facts here, and the speculative nature of an assertion that 23 Katerra would have succeeded if this had not happened, we felt 24 that we had really very significant obstacles to overcome to 25 bring that cause of action. And betting that multi-year,

158

1 multi-million dollar cause of action against an orderly  $2 \parallel$  liquidation of Katerra that could realize at least some 3 proceeds for the constituents was a hale Mary, bet-the-farm  $4 \parallel$  kind of situation and reluctantly, we -- we -- the board of 5 directors, the independent members of the board determined that 6 it would be irresponsible and imprudent to bet the farm on that cause of action.

- 8 BY MR. STASSEN:
- 9 Ms. Corrie, when the --

10 MR. STASSEN: I'm sorry, Your Honor. That completed 11 -- was that -- do you have follow up? Is there a follow-up 12 question from the Court?

13 THE COURT: No. No, no, no. Go ahead. I'm --MR. STASSEN: Okay. All right. 14

15 BY MR. STASSEN:

- Ms. Corrie, when the negative press came out in the Wall 16 17 Street Journal in relation to this \$440 million being owed to 18 Greensill which was, in fact, not owed, you testified that the 19 board -- two of the board members reached out to SoftBank, 20 perhaps management reached out to SoftBank. Correct?
- Management reached out to SoftBank after consulting with 21 22 the board.
- And isn't it true that the board felt it was important 24∥ that Katerra take its own stand and have its own public 25 $\parallel$  relations position with regard to whether or not that the \$440

159

Million was owed?

- A Well, Katerra was taking its own stand and was speaking to the sureties, the owners, the contractors, the subcontractors.

  Katerra did not want a public relations campaign because I guess we thought that it might not be the most effective way to deal with the misinformation and we really hoped that SoftBank would launch that campaign because certainly SoftBank was in a better position to do so than Katerra was. We had the document that showed the debt we paid in full, that the obligation had been paid and -- and discharged, and we certainly discussed that with our constituents.
- Q Well, it is a case that the board decided that at least initially that it was important to get the information out to the press sufficient to calm various constituents of Katerra, right? In other words, issue a press release. That was the initial thought of the board. Let's issue a press release, correct?
- A There was discussion about whether we would issue our own press release, yes. We certainly wanted to go toe to toe and overcome the negative impression in the press. I mean that was our --
- 22 Q How could --
- 23 A -- initial response.
- 24 Q Right. But the board didn't do that, did it?
- 25 A No, we didn't.

- Q And you didn't direct management to create a press release, did you? The board. When I say --
- 3 A Well, you're --
- $4 \ Q -- you$ , I mean the board.
- A Right. We worked with management to formulate a strategy
  where we would go to SoftBank and hopefully build a stronger
  case based on the actual facts of what happened between
  SoftBank and Greensill, which Katerra did not know.
- 9 Q So there's a Wall Street Journal article that is out there
  10 in the world saying you owe \$440 million, and the board
  11 initially thought we should respond with a press release but
  12 didn't, correct?
- 13 A Correct.
- Q Instead, the decision was made let's go interact with SoftBank and see if they'll do a media relations campaign, correct?
- A Well, those are your words, but we certainly asked for SoftBank's help in overcoming this perception in the press.
- 19 Q Okay. But you never -- the board never issued a press 20 release. Is that correct?
- 21 A The board did not issue a press release. That is correct.
- 22 Q Did the board make any members of management available to
- 23 Wall Street Journal or any -- or Blue Blood or, you know, CNBC
- 24 to address this issue in the public?
- 25  $\blacksquare$  A What the board did is it enlisted the advice of our

161

advisor -- of our professional legal advisor, and we sought
their guidance, as did management -- sought the guidance of our
outside counsel as to how best to proceed. And we received
that advice, and we followed that advice.

- Q Even though the board decided to do a press release? Did the advisors tell the board not to issue a press release or not respond in the media?
- 8 A We followed the advice of the advisors, which was to reach 9 out to SoftBank and -- as an initial matter.
- Q Okay. My question is did your advisors ever advise the board or management not to issue a press release correcting the record?
- MR. SUSSBERG: Mr. Stassen, are you asking about an attorney-client communication?
- 15 THE COURT: He is.
- 16 BY MR. STASSEN:
- Q Well, take the lawyers off the table for a second. Are there any advisors other than attorneys that you were asking about with regard to this issue?
- 20  $\mathbb{A}$  No, it was a attorney.
- Q Okay. Were -- I'll move on. Was Katerra for the board without the help of SoftBank able to turn around the public perception or let's take away the public perception. It's too general. The perception of sureties, Katerra sureties, that the \$440 million was not owed.

162

In a response to efforts of management, stock sureties, 1  $2 \parallel$  and to assure them that, in fact, that Greensill facility had  $3 \parallel$  been discharged, the surety said they were not in the business ||4|| -- effectively said they were not in the business of taking any 5 risks and regardless of whether Katerra had any actual 6 liability or not, if it was going to become embroiled in a big  $7 \parallel \text{kerfuffle} -- \text{that's a legal term} -- \text{with Greensill and the}$ 8 Greensill insolvency proceeding in Europe, they really were not willing to take that risk. That was not what they did, and 10∥they would want to cash collateralize any bonding line that they provided to -- to Katerra.

- As a result sort of and in conclusion, Ms. Corrie, as a --13 well, first of all, is it your pref -- would it be your 14 preference to have a DIP financing without the releases of SoftBank and its directors and officers -- appointed directors 16 and officers?
- Of course. Of course. 17
- 18 And as I understand your testimony -- or maybe I don't 19 want to reach a conclusion. You should reach the conclusion.

As a result of the analysis that you conducted in the investigation, is the reason why you'd rather have a DIP 22 $\parallel$  financing without the releases because you -- there is value to the claims that are being released?

24 I --Α

20

25 I understand that you were doing a balancing --

163

1 Α Sorry.

2

7

9

11

13

23

24

-- of DIP financing in-hand now versus you were saying, 3 you know, claims maybe coming due or being paid sometime later, 4 but my question is more overarching. In other words, there's 5 value -- you did recognize that there was some value in those 6 claims that you were investigating. Is that correct?

MR. SUSSBERG: I'm going to have to object to the 8 multiple compound question there.

THE COURT: It did go through a number of different 10 | gyrations.

Ms. Corrie, what do you believe you're giving up by 12 going along with the releases?

THE WITNESS: Truthfully, what I feel we're most 14 giving up is our ability to come to a collaborative resolution of this issue. I -- I truly believe that these claims are not 16 worth pursuing if you're going to be paying for litigation and 17 $\parallel$  spending good money after bad. I do not believe they are worth 18 pursuing. However, if the Committee had more time to evaluate 19 the claims and to take the depositions they want to take, and to gather the information they want to gather, I believe they would come to the same conclusion that Mr. Hefner and I came to, which is that it's not worth spending millions of dollars on litigation to pursue these claims.

And then finally -- since this is a compound 25∥ question, I'll give you a compound answer -- I know how cases

164

1 work. The Committee negotiates with a secured lender or the  $2 \parallel \text{DIP financier}$ , and they extract a benefit even if the claims  $3 \parallel$  are not worth very much. That's how it works. And if we 4 weren't releasing the claims under such pressure, because the 5 case is under such pressure because this is one of the most 6 dire situations I've seen in my many years of doing 7 restructuring, we're under terrible time pressure, and I feel 8 bad that the Committee has been under the same time pressure that we've been under and that they haven't been able to do the  $10 \parallel$  fulsome review that they want to do. I wish they had more time so they could come to the same conclusion I believe they would 12 that -- that I did.

So it's not that I feel that the claims have value. 14∥ It's that I feel that it's a consensual process with great value, and I would always want a consensual collaborative 16 process rather than having to force a result on one of the major constituents in this case, which is the unsecured 18 creditors committee, so I regret that.

THE COURT: Mr. Stassen.

MR. STASSEN: With that, Your Honor, I appreciate the testimony, and I pass the witness.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anyone else that opposes the DIP have any questions?

(No audible response)

13

19

20

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Corrie, you have sat and

1 listened to this now for roughly six hours, give or take. 2 have also had the benefit of reading the various objections, 3 position statements filed by the parties. You've heard the 4 | lawyers argue this afternoon from a number of different  $5 \parallel \text{viewpoints.}$  Have you heard anything that causes you to 6 reconsider your judgment? 7 THE WITNESS: I have not, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 9 Any redirect? MR. SUSSBERG: I think you just did it for me, Your 10 11 Honor. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Stassen, any recross on my one 13 question? 14 MR. STASSEN: No, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Any reason that Ms. Corrie can't go feed her puppies? 16 17 MR. STASSEN: No, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 19 Ms. Corrie, I appreciate your time this evening. 20 THE WITNESS: Thank you so much. THE COURT: Thank you. 21 22 (Witness excused) 23 THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Sussberg, my 24 recollection is that completes the debtor's case in chief. 25 MR. SUSSBERG: It does, Your Honor. We are